

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2016

**by Geoff Underwood BA(Hons) PGDip(UrbCons) MRTPI IHBC**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 14 June 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/16/3143340**

**144 Bayham Street, Camden, London NW1 0BA**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Ms Catherine McQueen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
  - The application Ref 2015/5586/P, dated 2 October 2015, was refused by notice dated 10 December 2015.
  - The development proposed is erection of mansard roof extension at third floor level to include front dormer window.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matter

2. The site is adjacent to a pair of listed buildings, 6 and 8 Greenland Road and whilst not referred to in the Council's decision notice, the Council's Delegated Report states that the proposal would negatively affect the setting of those heritage assets and I have therefore considered the effect on their setting in the main issues I have identified below.

## Main Issues

3. The main issues raised by this appeal are the effect the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and the effect it would have on nearby designated and non-designated heritage assets, in particular listed buildings at 6 and 8 Greenland Road and locally listed buildings at 136-140 and 146-152 Bayham Street.

## Reasons

4. The appeal site is an end terrace property and one of a group of three post war terraced houses which have a uniform appearance. These adjoin three older locally listed terraced houses (136-140 Bayham Street), all of which share brick frontages with parapets at roof level and (at the front) a vertical emphasis in their fenestration. Similar locally listed terraced houses (Nos 146-152) lie on the opposite the side of Greenland Road to the appeal property, which is situated on the corner.
  5. Greenland Road's streetscape to the north-east of Bayham Street is characterised by terraced houses of a similar scale and configuration, albeit with differing detailed design. This includes two listed buildings (Nos 6 and 8),
-

- the side elevation of which is situated in close proximity to the rear of the appeal property.
6. The setting of these listed building is largely composed of the attractive townscape of predominantly similar terraced houses in which they are located. The appeal property, by virtue of its relationship and proximity, makes an important contribution to their setting as part of this built context.
  7. The brick construction, simple form, similar proportions and similar parapet level, as well as its contribution to the wider terraced layout and character of surrounding streets, means that the appeal building's contribution to the setting of both the listed buildings and locally listed buildings is a positive one.
  8. Together these buildings form an attractive, historic and cohesive townscape, the lack of roof alterations above parapet level to which is an important component of its character and appearance.
  9. Due to its size, design and location the proposed extension would appear incongruous in this context both by disrupting the simple form of the host building and adding a substantial feature above parapet level of the wider group of buildings. In doing so it would detract from the harmony which currently exists in that group of terraced properties.
  10. The extension would be particularly prominent being located on the corner, an effect accentuated by the vertical extension of the flank wall. It would lead to a harmful unbalanced appearance in the context of the other buildings in the terrace and would disrupt the existing consistent roofscape in the vicinity of the corner of Bayham Street leading into Greenland Road. The matching walling materials and set back from the front elevation would not diminish these harmful effects to any material degree.
  11. As such the proposal would not comply with the Camden Core Strategy 2010-2025 Policy CS14 or Camden Development Policies 2010-2025 Policies DP24 and DP25. Together these development plan policies require development to be of the highest standard design that respects local context and character including the setting, context and the form of neighbouring buildings and the character and proportions of the existing building, as well as preserving or enhancing the Borough's heritage assets and their settings by not permitting development which harms the setting of a listed building. This is an approach which is consistent with that of the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) requirements for good design and conserving the historic environment.
  12. These policies are supported by Camden Planning Guidance CPG 1: Design, 2015 which advises that roof additions are unlikely to be acceptable in a range of circumstances, including where groups of buildings or terraces have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions; as is the case with the appeal site and its immediate neighbours.
  13. The effect of the proposal would materially harm the setting of the listed buildings and consequently their significance. Bearing in mind paragraph 132 of the Framework, having paid special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of these buildings, I have given this harm considerable importance and weight in reaching my decision.

14. Although this harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets would be less than substantial due to it affecting only one aspect of their setting, in the context of paragraph 134 of the Framework there is little evidence that the proposal would have any public benefits which would outweigh that harm.
15. Furthermore, in weighing the effect on the non-designated heritage assets on either side of the appeal site, on balance the proposal would also harm their significance through the inappropriate change to their setting.

### **Other Matters**

16. In support of her appeal the appellant refers to a substantial, largely glazed, roof extension to Nos 116-134, also a locally listed building. However, the substantial mid C20 former industrial building has a distinctly different character and appearance to that of the appeal site having a long frontage, largely set back from the adjoining terraced houses which flank it and having a fenestration pattern with has a distinctly horizontal emphasis. Also, its relative remoteness from the junction between Bayham Street and Greenland Road means it makes considerably less of a contribution to that area's terraced character.
17. That building therefore reads as a distinct and individual built form in its townscape setting in contrast to the traditionally proportioned terraces of houses within which it is situated. Furthermore, the extension is a single composition extending the full length of the host building, whereas the appeal proposal would only extend to one third of the group comprised of Nos 144-148. These material differences distinguish both the building and extension from the appeal site and means that the extension at Nos 116-134 has a very different effect on nearby heritage assets.
18. The existing mansard extension at No 114 is divorced from the group of buildings around the corner of Greenland Road and is not a typical roof alteration within the immediate vicinity of terraced houses on the east side of Bayham Street. I have not been presented with the circumstances of this case or the policies which applied at the time of its consideration.
19. In any event, notwithstanding the differences in location with the appeal site, the effect that this mansard extension has on the character and appearance of the host building and other similar buildings within the terrace serves to confirm the detrimental effects such alterations can have on the established townscape character of an area.
20. Although the appellant refers to the proposal's effect on the setting of Camden Town Conservation Area (CA) which lies opposite the appeal site I note that the Council have not raised any objections in this context. Those buildings within the CA on the opposite side of Bayham Street, including those with roof alterations referred to be the appellant (as well as those on Pratt Street), form part of a townscape whose appearance and character is more fractured, through the different ages, heights and individual designs of buildings, compared to the consistency of that in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site.
21. Whilst I have some sympathy with the appellant's desire to provide additional accommodation so that her family can remain in the property, these private benefits do not outweigh the harm identified above.

22. Consequently these other matters do not lead me to a different conclusion on the main issue.

**Conclusion**

23. For the reasons set out above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property, the area and the significance of nearby designated and non-designated heritage assets, albeit less than substantially, contrary to the development plan, planning guidance and the Framework. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

*Geoff Underwood*

INSPECTOR